

1. REVIEW OF THE 1952 CASES

1. The following were suggested (as have been offered, similar to the 1951 cases) (1) the date of sound date as the green subject; (2) the first many cases in the book of objects following the publication of the first report and second sightings of the 1953 occasion occurred in (3) the same instances of multiple sightings discussed in the 1951 cases (4) the following:

Collaborative, Ohio (1 August 1952); Princeton, Utah (2 July 1952); Salt Lake, Montana (15 August 1950); Scott, Montana (1 September 1950); Washington, D. C. area (20 July 1952); and Hazel, Arizona (1 August 1952); Red River, Michigan (29 July 1952); and Georges Isle, Maine (13 October 1952).

After review and discussion of these cases (and about 35 others, in this detail), the Panel concluded that reasonable explanations could be suggested for most sightings and the deduction and conclusion could be reached (given educational data) that other cases might be explained in a similar manner. The Panel pointed out that because of the locality of some sightings (e.g., 2-3 occasions) and the memory of the witnesses express themselves clearly (secondly) that a conclusive explanation could not be expected for every case reported. Furthermore, it was considered that, normally, it would be a great waste of effort to try to solve most of the sightings, while a much better would be to start a training and educational program (see "Final"). The writings of Charles Fort were referenced to show

1. All 11 sightings were reported (as have been other sightings).  
2. All 11 cases had the date of event date in the general vicinity  
3. The first three also, in the book of citizen follow-up are probably  
4. The first three and limited facilities of the AF23 operation command.  
5. In the same instances of significant sightings discussed in detail  
6. All 11 sightings

McMinnville, Ohio (1 August 1952); Preston, Utah (2 July 1952);  
Great Falls, Montana (15 August 1952); Rock, Montana (1 September  
1952); Washington, D. C. area (10 July 1952); and Elmira, New York  
Region (5 August 1952); Keweenaw River, Michigan (29 July 1952); and  
Briggs Hole, Idaho (13 October 1952).

After review and description of these cases (and about 75 others  
in this detail), the Panel concluded that reasonable explanations  
could be suggested for most sightings and they deducted and concluded  
that it could be expected (given additional data) that other cases  
might be explained in a similar manner<sup>2</sup>. The Panel pointed out that  
the time of the vicinity of some sightings (e.g., 2-3 seconds) and the  
sameness of the witness' appearance themselves clearly (second)  
that conclusive explanatory could not be expected for every case  
reported. Furthermore, it was considered that, normally, it would  
be a great waste of effort to try to solve most of the sightings,  
and a much effort would be made a training and educational program  
(first). The findings of Operation Port were referenced to show  
(first and) the findings of Operation Port were referenced to show



17  
Copied From Nearly  
Illegible Original

the "strange things in the sky" had been recorded for hundreds of years. It appeared obvious that there was no single explanation for a majority of the things seen. The presence of radar and other methods of detection on the Panel proved of value at once in their definite recognition of phenomena related to these fields. It was apparent that specialists in such additional fields as psychology, zoology, aerodynamics, climatology and military air operations would extend the ability of the Panel to recognize many other categories of mysterious phenomena.

#### STRANGE OBJECTS

The Panel concluded unanimously that there was no evidence of a direct threat to national security in the objects sighted. Instances of "Red Knights" were cited. These were unexplained phenomena sighted by aircraft pilots during World War II in both European and Far East theaters of operation wherein "balls of light" would fly near or with the aircraft and maneuver rapidly. They were believed to be electrostatic (similar to St. Elmo's fire) or electro-magnetic phenomena or possibly light reflections from ice crystals in the air, but their exact cause or nature was never defined. Both Robertson and Alvarez had been concerned in the investigation of these phenomena, but David T. Griggs (Professor of Geophysics at the University of California at Los Angeles) is believed to have been the most knowledgeable person on this subject. If the term "flying saucers" had been popular in 1943 - 1945, these objects would

1960, in an interview. In this interviewing that an at least one  
can accurately ~~test~~ the objects sighted was categorised by Robert  
and Merton as possibly "See Lighters", to date unexplained but not  
dangerous, they were not ~~large~~ thus to describe the sightings by  
calling them names. In this their feeling that these phenomena are  
not ~~object~~ the ~~descriptions~~ of present knowledge of physical objects because  
CONFIDENTIAL

It was the Panel's opinion that some of the Air Force's concern  
over U.F.O.'s (notwithstanding Mr. Defense Command and the C.I.A.  
public records) was probably induced by public pressure. The result  
being, is that the Air Force has instituted a fine channel for  
receiving reports of nearly anything anyone sees in the sky and  
claims to understand. This has been particularly encouraged in papers  
and commentaries on this and other subjects, such as space travel and  
aliens. The result is the mass receipt of low-grade reports  
which tend to overload channels of communication with material which  
is relevant to hostile objects that might some day appear. The Panel  
agreed generally that this mass of poor-quality reports containing  
little, if any, scientific data was of no value. Quite the opposite,  
so too possibly dangerous in having a military service foster public  
alarm in "nonburning incandescent lights". The implication being,  
since the interested agency was military, that these objects were  
subject to potential direct threats to national security. Accord-  
ingly, the need for declassification made itself apparent. Comments  
on a possible educational program are enunciated below.

(b) (6) (A) (2) (b) (5) (D) (E)

in the opinion of Mr. Robinson that the "missile" problem is best defined as to be distinguishable in nature from the detection and identification of German V-1 and V-2 guided missiles prior to their appearance, and in World War II. In the 1943-1944 intelligence situation (Crossbow), there was excellent intelligence and by July 1944 there was material evidence of the existence of "missiles". It is believed that cracked code was in existence. This evidence gave the U.S. investigators born a basis upon which to operate. The detection of any "missiles" resulting from unexplained U.F.O. sightings leads a U.S. investigator (in the first instance) to the I.M.C. problem. The results of these investigations, to date, strongly indicate that no evidence of hostile missiles or danger exists. Furthermore, the current reporting system would be no little value in the case of detection of enemy attack by conventional aircraft or guided missiles; under such conditions "missiles" would be available almost at once.

#### APPENDIX D: MISCELLANEOUS (CONT'D)

It was interesting to note that none of the members of the R.A.F. were bold to accept that this earth might be visited by extraterrestrial intelligent beings of some sort, some day. What they did say was any evidence that related the objects sighted to space travel. Mr. Pownall, in his presentation, showed how he had eliminated each of the known and probable causes of sightings, leaving him no mis-terrestrial as the only one remaining in many cases. Pownall's background as an aeronautical engineer and technical intelligence

• Another Project (Case, #44-1000 for 36 months) could not be  
launched. However, the Panel could not accept any of the cases  
at first, only because they were very unevaluated reports.  
Successful explanations of the sightings were suggested in some  
cases and in others the time of sighting was so short as to cause  
懷疑 of visual impressions. It was noted by Dr. Goulden and  
others that extraterrestrial artifacts, if they did exist, are not  
necessarily alarming; rather, they are in the scale of natural phenomena  
subject to scientific study, just as cosmic rays were at the time  
of their discovery 20 to 30 years ago. This was an attitude in  
which Mr. Robertson did not concur, as he felt that such artifacts  
would be of immediate and great concern not only to the U. S. but  
to all countries. (Working like a common threat to unite peoples)  
Dr. Ruge noted that present astronomical knowledge of the solar  
system makes the existence of intelligent beings (as we know the  
term) elsewhere than on the earth extremely unlikely, and the  
concentration of their attention by any controllable means confined  
to any one continent of the earth quite preposterous.

#### CONFIDENTIAL SOURCE

This case was considered significant because of the excellent  
documentary evidence in the form of Kodachrome motion picture films  
(about 1600 frames). The Panel studied these films, the case history,  
AMC interpretation, and received a briefing by representatives of  
the AF Photo Interpretation Laboratory on their analysis of the  
films. This term has expanded (as Air Force request) significantly

After an hour of professional and un-geocorrected time in the reconstruction of eight frames of individual frames of the film, the Panel agreed and collectively motioned that variation in the light intensity. It was the opinion of the P.I.L. representatives that the objects sighted were not birds, balloons or aircraft, and that aircraft because there was no "homing" while passing through the "air" and were, in essence, "colorless". Modes of motion and variation in light intensity of the objects were displayed, and the Panel Members were impressed by the evident deliberation, intensity and extent of effort of the P.I.L. team, they could not accept the conclusions reached. Some of the reasons for this were as follows:

1. A semi-spherical object can readily produce a reflection of sunlight without "reflecting" through  $60^{\circ}$  of one travel.
2. Although no fate was available on the P.I.L. of birds or particularly balloons in bright sunlight, the apparent motion, size and brightness of the objects were considered strongly to suggest birds, particularly after the Panel viewed a short film showing high reflectivity of seagulls in bright sunlight.
3. P.I.L. description of the objects sighted as "circles, blackish-brown" in color would be expected in cases of lightless reflections of sunlight from convex surfaces where the brilliancy of the reflection would obscure other portions of the objects.

1. The lights in the Great Falls case were believed to have probably been aircraft, and the bright lights with reflectors.  
2. There was no valid reason for the attempt to isolate the objects in the Sectional lighting to Gocco in the Great Falls sighting. This may have been due to misunderstanding in Nodr directive. The objects in the Great Falls sighting are strongly suspected of being reflections of aircraft known to have been in the area.  
3. The difficulty change in the Sectional lights was too great for acceptance of the Nodr hypothesis that the apparent colored and changing intensity of the lights indicated extremely high speed for small aircraft traffic.  
4. Apparent lack of guidance of investigations by Gocco familiar with U.P.O. reports and explanations.  
5. Analysis of light intensity of objects made from duplicate rather than original film. The original film was noted to have a much brighter background (reflecting relative brightness of objects) and the object to appeared much less bright.  
6. Method of obtaining data of light intensity appeared faulty because of unavailability of equipment and questionable assumptions in making averages of readings.  
7. No data had been obtained on the sensitivity of Kodakplate with to light of various intensities using the same camera type at the same lens openings.

... that either the number (either the three early part of  
Operation 212a) were not received from the places of the  
original issue prior to the end of the 212a.

... that suffered directly from the data available on this  
regarding the minimum probability classification of certain data  
a. Used by the Japanese submarine Yoshinogami to follow radar  
over the air under certain weather conditions, showing how 224.60  
and 224.80 characters can be transmitted simultaneously and  
b. Used by Japanese submarine to pick up objects from their own rock  
travers. It can reasonably be assumed that such items would prob-  
ably have considerable importance of value in an effortful ex-  
ploring program. However, the Rock types were the least in desirability  
and the effect required to follow up and update every one of the  
various or new objects involved through channels such as the 224.60  
and 224.80 would be prohibitory. It was felt that there will always be  
problems, for which complete data is needed, that can only be  
obtained with consequent delay and with a long time delay, if  
at all. The long delay in obtaining operating codes to oil drums  
and barrels in tanks, and in the updating process should  
not be a major problem to日本 who in popular feeling that  
they do not, no better have given the 212a, and to be exploded in detail  
in which should be concerned the subsequent more confidential  
and specific to be developed, will be completely and necessarily  
disclosed. In other words, the burden of proof is on the Japanese  
... English ...

1996-1997 学年第一学期

... Russell Mifflin were the respondents to the 0/02 complaint letter, although evidence of any direct financial benefit to the rightsholders was not a conclusive predicate to injury within the meaning of Section

- a. Re-submission of certain entry certificates by defence personnel.
- b. Consignment of cargo, for repacking consigned with " غير معرف " (Unknown) (Article 2, Article 1, original content analogy) (Unknown).
- c. Submission of claims to third parties and evidence related to the specific cargo project involved.

Although this committee only has charge of the first two of these problems, it is probably sufficient that the Intelligence Headquarters, and, should be established by the committee, generally within 120 days of U.S.A.'s becoming the aggressor, in accordance to the "flying suspect" scenario, or if possible, the standards are commensurate with those and properly documented requirements, the capability of detecting hostile activity will be reduced.

Dr. Hugo noted that more competent concerning or following of reported sightings at or near the source is required, and that this can best be accomplished by an additional program.

Digitized by srujanika@gmail.com

The map prepared by 1983 showing geographic locations of officially reported unconfirmed sightings (1982 only) was examined by the Fruel. Also, 1982 channel characters in certain strategic areas such as Los Alamos, were mapped to explain on the basis of 24-hour watchful guard and

20. The Panel recommended that the ATIC should be discontinued. On the other hand, it is felt that no mitigation for the possibility of continuing military aircraft sightings would be satisfactorily provided unless a series of unclassified sightings for non-classified areas. Furthermore, there appears to be no logical relationship to population centers. The Panel could find no valid justification for these sightings. To this effect, however, that all prospective sightings were to be observed so as to identify what would be seen first near foreign areas rather than around U. S. cities.

#### RECOMMENDATION

The Panel was of the opinion that the present ATIC program to place 200 inexpensive 95 mm. stereo cameras in the hands of various amateur camera operators would probably produce little usable data, but nothing to U.P.O.C. However, it was recognized that public concern of this concern was partly the result of public pressure in July 1952. With the poor results of the year-long Project ATIC, a program of 24-hour instrumentation watch (two frames of 500 ft. showing nothing distinguishable), a widespread program of citizen watching would not be expected to yield much direct data of value.

There was considerable discussion of a possible "city patrol" by amateur astronomers (Nyquist) and by wide-angle cameras (Pugs). Dr. Pugs and Dr. Robertson pointed out that at present a considerable fraction

... 20. Dr. R. H. Dicke, of the Harvard College Observatory, under surveillance  
of the Air Force for several months, and accurate observing programs are  
now in progress at the various institutions listed below.

With the exception of three observations so far only  
one of which is definite, no more than unidentified objects, no one of any  
sort, is specifically known to Dr. R. H. Dicke or Dr. M. J. Smith.  
The object would most certainly be reported if found on patrol planes.

... He has stated that an astronomer refused to interrupt his  
stays in order to photograph an alleged sighting in a different  
part of the sky. This led Dr. Dicke to say that, if a program of  
watching could be an adjunct of planned astronomical programs, little  
work would be involved and that the greatest astronomical personnel  
would be engaged in sightings of an unidentified object.

The location of some of these programs and their directors are  
summarized as follows:

- a. Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U. S. A. (asteroid patrol),  
McLaughlin.
- b. Yerkes Observatory, University of Chicago and Fort Davis, Texas  
(several programs) - Moshell (asteroids), Kuiper (asteroids),  
Hough (wide angle camera).
- c. University of Alaska, Fairbanks (asteroids) - Levy
- d. Dominion Observatory, Ottawa (meteors) - Williams
- e. Lick Observatory, California (sky map) - Minkowski
- f. McDonald Observatory, California (sky map) - Schild

It was agreed by the Panel that no government-sponsored program of artificial intelligence may proceed to testable as the present time, and that the development of certain technologies to undertake such a task must not have the desired effect of over-emphasizing existing threat stories in the public mind. However, the issue of radar decoys caused the preceding paragraph of this paper would serve several purposes, including the better understanding of radar interference as well as identification of U.S.A. 30.

#### U.S.A. 30 AND INTERNAL INTERFERENCE

This characteristic problem of radar operations was the pulse signal (of approximately the same frequency) from station A may be picked up on the screen of station B and then as a high-speed track of series of dots was recognized to have probably caused a number of U.S.A. reports. This problem was undecided by information received by identifying ADC concern in solving this problem of signal identification before service use of very high-speed aircraft or guided missiles (U.S.A. 30). The Service believed that one answer to this problem was the use of a "coupler filter" in the receiving circuit. (Dr. Alvarez) suggested that the problem might be better solved by the use of a "coupler filter" where the operator receiving "key spot tracks" (in the order of 1000-20,000 dipole) would operate a device which would alter slightly his station's pulse frequency ratio. If the signal received on the screen had been caused by mutual interference with another station, the track would now show dipole at a different distance.

and the nature of the source, as is often supposed at all. Mr. Mignot  
himself had a telephone connection into the office and could access such files from  
the "operator's desk".

#### TELEVISION MONITORING

The reported cases were examined: one at Palomar Mountain, California, in October 1950, when several sky observers were "well aware for a few seconds" apparently while at 5750 ft flying objects was observed visually; and two, a series of observations by the Los Angeles Star Meteorite Association from August 1950 to October 1952, when objects very close indeed to observers behaved  
strangely. Observers' accounts and records were available for the 1950 case.  
The witness was able quickly to point out that the recorded date was  
indefinitely due to instrumental effects that would have been recognized  
as such by more experienced observers.

The implication that "radiactive effects were correlated with  
unidentified flying objects in these two cases was, therefore, rejected  
by the Panel.

#### EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

The Panel's concept of a broad educational program integrating information  
from all concerned agencies was that it should have two major  
aims: *recognition and identification*.

The training aim would result in proper recognition of usually  
well-known objects (e.g., balloons, aircraft reflections) as well as  
natural phenomena (meteors, dustballs, mirages, noctilucent clouds).  
Both natural and radar recognition are concerned. There would be many

Results of such education from collected resources to occur and as much personnel. Initiative efforts and degree of implementation of proposed programs would correspond to the categories of entry (e.g., initial operations, partial control under operating Ground Observer Corps procedures, and efforts not initiated into an other categories.) This leading could result in a marked reduction in reported cases by misidentification and inaccurate conclusions.

The following can result in reduction in public interest in "flying saucers" which today enjoys a strong psychological attraction. This attraction could be accomplished by such media as television, motion pictures, and popular writing. Parts of such education would be aimed at those interests which had been piling at first in interest engendered. As in the case of conjuring tricks, there is much less satisfaction at the "secret" to find. Such a program should tend to reduce the current gullibility of the public and consequently their susceptibility to clever hostile propaganda. The Panel noted that the general interest of Mexican personnel based on a subject with so many outcomes possibilities for exploitation might indicate a possible Mexican anti U.S. policy.

Results of the Panel's various suggestions related to the planning of such an educational program. It was felt strongly that psychologists familiar with mass psychology should advise on the nature and content of the program. In this connection, Dr. Hollley Gantrell (Princeton University) was suggested. Gantrell published "Invasion from

2000, in study on the psychology of panic, written about the famous  
Dr. Walter Rauschenbach (1920) and his same performed education  
psychology studies in the field of psychology. The names of Ben Karpoff  
(University of Michigan) and Leo Rosten were mentioned as possibly  
available as consulting psychologists. Also, someone familiar with  
radio communication techniques, perhaps an advertising expert, would be  
helpful. Dr. George C. H. H. suggested as possibly a valuable source  
of communication techniques was sufficient of certain levels. Dr. Karpoff  
suggested the U. S. Navy (OSI) Special Devices Center, San Diego, Calif.,  
as a potentially valuable organization to assist in such an educational  
program. The training techniques used by this agency for educational  
communications during the past are given as an example of a similar  
educational tool. The Sanitary Co., which made World War II training  
films (motion picture and slide strips) was also suggested, as well as  
Walt Disney, Inc., estimated experts. Dr. Hirsch suggested that the  
current conferences in the U. S. might be a potential source of educated  
adult talent to spread the gospel. It was believed that business  
offices, high schools, colleges, and television stations would all be  
planned to cooperate in the showing of documentary type motion pictures  
as prepared in an interesting manner. The use of two cases showing  
the "Mystery" and the "Panic" would be forceful.  
To plan and execute such a program, the Panel believed was to  
recall back. The current investigatory group at AEC would, of necessity,  
have to be closely integrated for support with respect to not only the



2. The following are possible targets in different directions  
and under the existing conditions of the office.

2.1. Any of the on the page. Agents and informants and a informant  
or a plain robbery claim would be necessary in addition. The Ramb  
or the men from ARGO's office, particularly expected as necessary,  
and to work with in implementing any action taken as a result of  
the recommendations. Experience and records in ARGO would be of value  
in this public educational and service training program envisaged.

2.2. Rebuttal of 2nd, that is the opinion that after public gallantry  
display and the service organisations, such as ARGO, had been trusted  
to do the more readily concluded opinion sightings, there would  
still be a role for a very modest-sized ARGO section to cope with the  
problem of items of possible scientific intelligence value. This  
section should concentrate on energetically following up (perhaps on  
the lines of Classified Air Force Scientific Advisory Board members)  
on the cases which seemed to indicate the presence of unscrupulous  
casing artifacts. Reports of such artifacts would be expected to  
come mainly from Western districts in far closer proximity to the  
Ramb. Certain other factors, Ramb

#### 2.3. PERSONAL INVESTIGATIONS

The Ramb took cognizance of the existence of such groups as the  
"Million Flying School Investigators" (Los Angeles) and the "Martial  
Research Research Organization" (Unincorporated). It was believed that  
such organizations should be watched because of their potentially



1. Drawing 50-1100000-071002, dated 20th  
July 1950, is a drawing of a small metal  
component, possibly a connector or a  
small part of a larger assembly. It is  
approximately 10mm long and 5mm wide.  
2. The drawing shows a top view of the  
component, which has a rectangular  
shape with a central slot or opening.  
3. The drawing includes a title block  
containing the following information:  
- Drawing number: 50-1100000-071002  
- Date: 20/7/50  
- Description: A small metal component  
- Scale: 1:10  
- Drawing date: 20/7/50  
- Drawing by: G. G. DURANT III  
- Checked by: J. H. SMITH  
- Approved by: G. G. DURANT III

50-1100000-071002  
G. G. DURANT III  
J. H. SMITH  
G. G. DURANT III

## CHIEF OF STAFF

GENERAL STAFF

COMBINED STAFF

## CHIEF OF STAFF

GENERAL STAFF

COMBINED STAFF

262 3

لهم إني أنت عدو  
لهم إني أنت عدو  
لهم إني أنت عدو  
لهم إني أنت عدو

200 193

卷之三

1. *Long Island, New York*  
2. *Long Island, New York*

• 1996-1997 • 1997-1998

Vol. 1. Photo. (Continued)  
South - South America

وَالْمُؤْمِنُونَ الْمُؤْمِنَاتُ وَالْمُؤْمِنُونَ الْمُؤْمِنَاتُ

三一五

Digitized by srujanika@gmail.com

## INTERVIEW WITH GENE

Digitized by srujanika@gmail.com

卷之三

TAB 2

15. Recent pictures of subject in flight uniform showing high radioactivity.
16. One flight or Report to subject by U.S. Air Force in U. S. Air Forces.
17. Sample of subject TIME Reporting Form and Copies of Periodic subject Army and Navy Orders Relating to subject.
18. Sample Polyethylene subject Balloon (54 inches square).
19. Publications on Radar Coverage, CHM 101 (Manual illustrating unusual operating characteristics of Service radars).
20. Miscellaneous official letters and foreign intelligence reports identifying subject.
21. Copies of popular publications subject dealing with subject (articles in subject magazine, newspaper, magazine and books).